

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vuong (US 6,765,912) in view of Chang (US 6,728,249). Claims 21-25 were allowed.

The Office action responds to Applicant's previous traversal arguments by stating that those arguments are moot due to the "new ground(s) of rejection." Although the Office Action elaborates on the rationale for the rejection, the grounds do not appear to have changed insofar as the references are the same. The upshot of the rejection again seems to be that Vuong discloses a system that receives ATM cells and converts them to TDM format, while Chang discloses a technique for routing ATM cells into a LANE network by reading the contents of the ATM cell headers, with some ATM cells being treated differently than others based on the cell header content. Applicant has no disagreement with this characterization of the references. However, notably absent from the Office Action discussion is any explanation of where the amended clauses of claims 1 and 11 (per the Amendment filed on 2/11/05) are to be found in either Vuong or Chang (individually or collectively).

In the Amendment filed on 2/11/05, independent claims 1 and 11 were amended to clarify that the translating of cell headers of ATM cells according to a predetermined translation scheme is based on cell payload type, and that the translated cell headers are applied to the ATM cells as ATM cell headers, with the new ATM cell headers containing fields that determine how the ATM cells will be processed. The ATM cells are then forwarded with the translated ATM cell headers applied thereto.

Although the Chang reference is cited as teaching ATM cell handling based on cell header content, it does not teach the recited translation steps wherein ATM cells arrive with

original ATM cell headers, then have their headers translated so that the same ATM cells are given new ATM cell headers that facilitate handling based on cell content. Stated another way, the ATM cells have two different ATM cell headers at different times, one being an untranslated ATM cell header and the other being a translated ATM cell header. Importantly, both headers are ATM cell headers, not LAN headers, MAC headers or other headers associated with different packet types.

No such ATM cell header swapping is disclosed in Figs. 2/4 or column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 30 of Chang (cited in the Office Action). To the extent that the Office disagrees with this characterization of Chang, it is respectfully requested to cite to the portions of Chang where the foregoing elements of Claims 1 and 11 are believed to be disclosed.

As such, it is believed that independent claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 should likewise be allowable for the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that all rejections be withdrawn and that Notices of Allowability and Allowance be duly issued.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter W. Duft
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,948

Law Offices of Walter W. Duft
8616 Main Street, Suite 2
Williamsville, New York 14221
Telephone: (716) 633-1930
Facsimile: (716) 633-1932